

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE – Art Unit 1753**Attorney Docket No. 291958176US2
SEMITOOL REF No. P97-0013US3**REMARKS**

Claims 3, 5 and 6 are presently pending in the application. The undersigned wishes to thank Examiner Mutschler for conducting a personal interview on May 6, 2004. The Interview Summary provided by the Examiner is enclosed with this paper.

A. Response to Section 102 Rejection—Ishida

Claim 3 was rejected under Section 102 over U.S. Patent No. 5,447,615 issued to Ishida ("Ishida"). Claim 3 has been amended in this paper exactly in accordance with the amendments agreed upon by the Examiner. Therefore, in accordance with the agreement reached with the Examiner, claim 3 is patentable over Ishida.

B. Response to Section 102 Rejection—Stevens

Claims 3, 5 and 6 were rejected under Section 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,251,236 issued to Stevens ("Stevens"). Stevens is not prior art under Section 102(e) because the priority date of the present application antedates that of Stevens. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

C. Response to Section 102(e) Rejection—Patton et al.

Claim 3 was also rejected under Section 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,156,167 issued to Patton et al. ("Patton"). As with Stevens, the priority date of the present application antedates that of Patton. Therefore, the rejection of claim 3 over Patton should also be withdrawn.

D. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the pending claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and patentably define over the applied art. Applicants accordingly request reconsideration of the application and a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call at (206) 359-3258.

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE - Art Unit 1753**

Attorney Docket No. 291958176US2

SEMITOOL REF No. P97-0013US3

Respectfully submitted,

Perkins Coie LLP

Date: May 10, 2004

P. T. Parker
Paul T. Parker
Registration No. 38,264

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 25096

Perkins Coie LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 359-8000

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/390,501

Applicant(s)

BATZ ET AL.

Examiner

Brian L. Mutschler

Art Unit

1753

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Brian L. Mutschler.

(3) _____.

(2) Paul Parker.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 06 May 2004.Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all pending.Identification of prior art discussed: Ishida, Patton et al., Stevens.Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Brian L. Mutschler 5/16/2004
Examiner's signature, if required